he writes: * But, of course, much mystery remains. If the organizer itself is of a relatively simple chemical nature, all the more morphogenetic onus is thrown on the competent ectoderm which reacts to it. How is it that this can fold itself into a tube ? How is it that the tube can acquire a difference between its two ends ? * And, of course, these are only the very simplest of the organizing morphogenetic incidents. We have still the same sort of question to repeat and to answer ten thousand times before we shall have explained, either ' in material terms ' (as Huxley implies the explanation is already given by the blessed word * organizer') or in any other terms, the development of so simple a creature as a sea-urchin or a newt.

There are, of course, grafting experiments of a different order which have been used to confuse the question at issue. A piece of tissue which has already become highly differentiated has been in some cases successfully grafted. In such cases the transplanted tissue usually continues its own line of development; and it may induce adaptive changes in the developmental course of neighbouring tissues of its host. Thus the head of a certain worm grafted on to the tail end of another may induce the formation of mouth organs from the tissues of the host. Needham tells us that the most recent work along these lines ' has led to separation of the organizer-concept into two '. The two concepts resulting from this division are evocation and individuation. The former is strictly hormonic, the latter requires * the concept of

the biological field'. Now, of recent years much play has been made with this concept of biological fields. For, since physicists talk of fields and field-concepts and field-physics, it is felt that to introduce the ' field-concept' into biology goes